

EXHIBIT G

to

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Civil Action No.: 1:10-cv-00986-JFA

Peer Review Reports

SCORING

Standard of Care

- 1 Good quality of care-Appropriate, no issue with the physician care
- 2 Documentation deficiencies
 - a. No issue with physician documentation
 - b. Does not substantiate clinical course, treatment and plan of care
 - c. Not timely to communicate with other care givers
 - d. Unreadable
 - e. Other
- 3 Care varied from best practice

Controversial-no major issues, varies from best practice
- 4 Care varied from best practice-no patient harm

Controversial-care varied from best practice: no patient harm
- 5 Care varied from best practice

Controversial-care varied from best practice: could harm patient
- 6 Care varied from best practice – did harm patient
 - a. Minor adverse outcome (complex recovery expected)
 - b. Major adverse outcome (complex recovery expected)
 - c. Catastrophic adverse outcome (death)

Disposition/Recommendation

- 1 Send letter
- 2 Refer to committee
- 3 Refer to MEC
- 4 Refer to External Peer Review
- 5 Other recommendation
- 6 Trend
- 7 No action required

Addendum A

2-24-10
130pm

SCORING

Standard of Care

- 1 **Good quality of care**-Appropriate, no issue with the physician care
- 2 **Documentation deficiencies**
 - a. No issue with physician documentation
 - b. Does not substantiate clinical course, treatment and plan of care
 - c. Not timely to communicate with other care givers
 - d. Unreadable
 - e. Other
- 3 **Care varied from best practice**
Controversial-no major issues, varies from best practice
- 4 **Care varied from best practice-no patient harm**
Controversial-care varied from best practice: no patient harm
- 5 **Care varied from best practice**
Controversial-care varied from best practice: could harm patient
- 6 **Care varied from best practice - did harm patient**
 - a. Minor adverse outcome (complex recovery expected)
 - b. Major adverse outcome (complex recovery expected)
 - c. Catastrophic adverse outcome (death)

Disposition/Recommendation

- 1 Send letter
- 2 Refer to committee
- 3 Refer to MEC
- 4 Refer to External Peer Review
- 5 Other recommendation : *SUSPEND SUMMARY.*
- 6 Trend
- 7 No action required

Minto
2/24/10

Addendum A

CONFIDENTIAL
Peer Review Material

CONFIDENTIAL
MEDICAL PEER REVIEW
DO NOT PHOTOCOPY

Presentation 1156 Delivery 1911

CONFIDENTIAL
MEDICAL PEER REVIEW
DO NOT PHOTOCOPY

Why did MD leave unit with maternal pain, decels, no improv. despite resuscitation measures.

"Abruptio a clinical diagnosis"

Type of Incision: did surgeon recognize urgency prior. If so why Pfannestiel. If no recognition why not?

CHOICE OF ANESTHESIA: SPINAL why NOT GENERAL
How does OB know about "brain stem"?

Pathology: how is there deterioration of skin with heart rate be on admission
Peds noted cyanosis not "deterioration"

CORRECT Nursing record fluid clear / or report bloody

Nurses recognized need for C-section.
Was this relayed and why MD did not MP.

ARMC / MM 00003

Suspend - Summary Immediate due to concern over patient safety

Multi